United Nations S/PV.8310

Security Council

Seventy-third year

Provisional

8310th meeting

Friday, 13 July 2018, 10.20 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Skoog	(Sweden)
Members:	Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Mr. Llorentty Soliz
	China	Mr. Ma Zhaoxu
	Côte d'Ivoire	Mr. Adom
	Equatorial Guinea	Mr. Ndong Mba
	Ethiopia	Mr. Alemu
	France	Mr. Delattre
	Kazakhstan	Mr. Tumysh
	Kuwait	Mr. Alotaibi
	Netherlands	Mr. Van Oosterom
	Peru	Mr. Meza-Cuadra
	Poland	Mr. Lewicki
	Russian Federation	Mr. Polyanskiy
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Ms. Pierce
	United States of America	Mrs. Haley

Agenda

Reports of the Secretary-General on the Sudan and South Sudan

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the translation of speeches delivered in other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-0506 (verbatimrecords@un.org). Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org).

18-22199 (E)

Accessible document Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Reports of the Secretary-General on the Sudan and South Sudan

The President: In accordance with rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite the representative of South Sudan to participate in this meeting.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

Members of the Council have before them document S/2018/691, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by the United States of America.

The Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it.

I now give the floor to those members of the Council who wish to make statements before the vote.

Mrs. Haley (United States of America): First, I would like to thank our new colleague from Côte d'Ivoire. We are very excited to have Ambassador Adom with us and look forward to working with him. We welcome him.

I take the floor before the vote because we have reached a critical moment. The people of South Sudan have endured unimaginable suffering and unspeakable atrocities. Their leaders have failed them. They are desperate to get the most basic food, medicine and shelter, but above all, they just want the violence to stop. Anyone who has been to South Sudan knows that. The stories of the victims haunt us. One 14-year-old girl from Leer county in South Sudan recently put it like this:

> "All the violence I have witnessed is something I can never forget. How can I forget the sight of an old man whose throat was slit with a knife before being set on fire? How can I forget the smell of those decomposed bodies of old men and children pecked and eaten by birds? How can I forget those women who were hanged and died up in the tree?"

This girl is 14-years-old. She will never forget the atrocities she witnessed, and neither can we.

We can do more than just sit here and listen to these horror stories. We can do more than just express our sympathy with empty words. We can take action.

Today, the United States has introduced a draft resolution (S/2018/691) that would impose an arms embargo and new sanctions against some of the people responsible for the violence. The goal of the draft resolution is simple. If we are going to help the people of South Sudan, we need the violence to stop, and to stop the violence we need to stop the flow of weapons that armed groups are using to fight each other and terrorize the people. We must stop the weapons and stop the violence. This is a draft resolution that everyone on the Security Council should support.

Sadly, the idea of an arms embargo for South Sudan is not a new one. In 2016, the United States proposed it. We certainly should have imposed the embargo at that time and probably a lot earlier, but the proposal failed. We can only imagine how many weapons have made their way to parties in South Sudan since then and how many more people have had to die. These are the weapons that armed groups use to shoot fathers in front of their wives and children, to hold up convoys of food aid or to assault women and girls. The Security Council had an opportunity to help put a stop to this, but we failed. We carry that burden with us.

The United States is determined that we will not turn our backs on people of South Sudan again. We have tried everything to achieve a real ceasefire in South Sudan. We have given the parties many chances to change their behaviour, and it is impossible to keep track. We have waited and waited for negotiations to make a difference. Time passes but the fighting in South Sudan never stops.

The United Nations recently came out with a report that looked at the violence in just one state of South Sudan in the brief period from 16 April to 24 May of this year. Over those six weeks, the United Nations found that armed forces had attacked 40 villages; 120 women and girls were raped or gang-raped; 232 civilians were killed, including 35 children; 25 people were killed by hanging; 63 children, elderly persons and people with disabilities were burned alive. Armed groups in South Sudan are literally burning people alive and hanging them from trees. This is barbaric, and again all of this violence happened over a period of just six weeks in one state.

The irony in this context is that all of this fighting took place after the parties signed the cessation of hostilities agreement in December. Every few months, it seems, we see announcements that the parties have agreed to a new ceasefire. Sometimes they even call these ceasefires "permanent". These ceasefires have never held. The only certainty about a ceasefire in South Sudan is that the parties will violate them in a few hours.

So the issue before us today is quite simple. Why would we possibly want to give the people responsible for this madness more weapons? Why would we give the parties more opportunities to attack the people of South Sudan? How do we explain to the people of South Sudan that we are willing to let their tormentors get new weapons? More arms for South Sudan cannot be the answer.

We have heard the argument that an arms embargo might undermine the peace process. To be clear, the United States supports the peace process in South Sudan. We want nothing more than to see this dialogue work out. The arms embargo is a measure to protect civilians and help stop the violence. For negotiations to work, we must end the cycle of broken promises to stick to the ceasefire. Peace in South Sudan will not come by letting the parties get their hands on more weapons. The opposite is true. Supporting an arms embargo will show the parties that we are fed up with the delays and the stalling. It will show our resolve to make life better for the people of South Sudan.

For too long, the Security Council has failed these people. We failed to impose an arms embargo years ago when we could have helped prevent so much suffering. We have failed to stop the fighting. We have failed to hold South Sudan's leaders accountable for the misery they have caused. But today we can and we must defy this history. We can come together to show South Sudan that the era of impunity is over. We can show the world that the Security Council will live up to its responsibility to help maintain international peace and security. Above all, we can send a small signal of hope to the people of South Sudan. By adopting the draft resolution, we can stand in solidarity with them and at long last show that we are able to help.

The United States urges all members of the Security Council to do what is right for the people of South Sudan. We urge them to vote in favour of this draft resolution.

Mr. Alemu (Ethiopia): I want to more formally welcome my brother the Permanent Representative of Côte d'Ivoire.

We are at a very critical juncture in the peace process in South Sudan. The High-Level Revitalization Forum has made notable progress and for the first time in a long while there is some hope for a possible breakthrough. The parties have already reached an agreement on security arrangements and the reports from Khartoum are indicating that they are closer than they have ever been to reaching an agreement on governance issues.

The decision we are going to make today in connection with sanctions would have very serious implications for the peace process. That is why the region and, I might add, the continent are asking for the situation to be handled with prudence and patience. Why? It should be handled with prudence and patience because without them whatever human rights violations there are today, they could be even worse. Averting the worst is our objective.

For the Security Council to take such action without synchronizing its position with the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) and the African Union (AU) will not only be unhelpful, but it will seriously undermine the peace process and does not reflect well on the cooperation and partnership between the United Nations and regional organizations, which all of us strive to see strengthened.

While in no way opposed to punitive measures, it is the view of the AU and IGAD that now is not the appropriate time for taking such measures. The IGAD Council of Ministers has made it clear that pursuing such a course of action at this stage would not behelpful at all. That is a matter of judgement, taking into account the complexities of the situation. The same view is also reflected by the AU Peace and Security Council. Lending deaf ears to the opinion of the two organizations that have invested so much in the peace process and would be the most affected by its failure runs roughshod over the principles that underpin the cooperation between the United Nations and regional organizations. The cause of peace and the protection of civilians, which we so much want to see advanced, would have less chance of succeeding if, in the light of the position being taken by IGAD and the AU, the Security Council ended up being an outlier and in sharp disagreement with the two regional organizations. That

is why we call upon each member of the Council to heed the calls of the region and cast their vote in a manner that would enhance the unity of purpose among the three organizations. After all, it is that unity of purpose which will break or make the peace process.

Resorting to immediate sanctions at this point in time would amount to not taking into account the progress that has been made so far. Under those circumstances, it would not be surprising if, were draft resolution S/2018/691 to be adopted, it ended up confusing the parties for they would find it difficult to reconcile the action of the Council with the reality of the peace process. The parties would be absolutely justified in expecting encouragement from the Council for the progress made no matter how far they might still have to go to achieve a breakthrough. But what they might see is the opposite in what, for them and for those who follow the South Sudanese peace process closely, is a paradox. One does not get punished for having made progress.

We have heard the argument being made that nothing has changed in the peace process, in that the parties are simply going through the motions, but what we have seen lately is quite different. The Council should indeed be appreciative of what the Presidents of Uganda and the Sudan did in engaging in a well-calibrated joint effort to nudge the parties towards peace, which culminated in a possible scenario whereby President Salva Kiir and Mr. Machar might be in the Government together — the former returning to his position and the latter as the First Vice President. If that is not progress, then what is? That is why we find it difficult to vote in favour of the draft resolution before us (S/2018/691) and why, in our view, other Council members should not as well. That is the advice both IGAD and the AU are giving to the Council.

We wish to thank in advance all Council members who are respectful of the views of regional organizations and act accordingly. There should be no confusion. There is a solution that does not reflect the spirit and principle that should underpin the cooperation between the United Nations and the African Union. What is equally troubling is that this proposed course of action does not meet the consensus of Council members. A divided Council in this issue, we all know, will not be helpful to the peace process because it will send the wrong message to the parties, the result of which will be a loss of the Council's credibility and therefore its leverage. That is what we have been trying to avoid, but to no avail.

Before concluding, I must express appreciation to our colleagues, representatives of the three African States members of the Council, for all the efforts we made together to support the position of the AU on this critical matter.

Mr. Ndong Mba (Equatorial Guinea) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Republic of Equatorial Guinea fears that today is a sad day for the relationship between the Organization and the African continent. The text that has been proposed and draft resolution S/2018/691, which will be voted on, is a step backwards in the many efforts that are being made on both sides to build a sound relationship based on mutual trust and on the pursuit of common goals.

Our position is well known. The Council's imposition of sanctions at this time would involve not just a counterproductive interference in the undeniable positive progress that has been made on the ground, but also reflect a clear lack of consideration for the States and regional organizations involved. We deeply regret that our colleagues in the Council have decided to take that course of action. Equatorial Guinea believes that the message that should go out from this Chamber is one of recognition, support and encouragement for the efforts that both the Intergovernmental Authority on Development and the African Union, in particular President Al-Bashir of the Sudan and President Museveni of Uganda, have been making and which, in recent weeks, have produced tangible results.

Clearly, one cannot expect the signed agreements to change the situation radically overnight. That would be naive, and I do not believe that anyone sitting in this Chamber is naive. It takes time for the compromises reached to take effect and all the more so in a conflict like this one, in South Sudan, that involves many actors and different situations. Time — that is what we have been asking for — a little more time. A prudent time frame is required to evaluate and monitor the implementation and viability of those agreements and, where necessary, to take appropriate action against those who breach them or obstruct peace. Meanwhile, none of us has the moral authority or legitimacy to rule out such efforts a priori.

We all agree that the parties must be pressured to establish a secure and lasting peace in South Sudan,

but we urge that such pressure be exerted, as it is now, by regional actors, with the support and faith of the Council, and without any lack of consideration or the disregard that is being shown. However, like every other member of the Council, we wish the best for the young people of South Sudan who have already suffered more than enough. Similarly, we express our support for the country's leaders so that they can rise to the occasion and take advantage of this new opportunity to achieve peace. For that reason, the Republic of Equatorial Guinea will abstain in the voting on draft resolution S/2018/691 so as provide the political actors and institutions of the region with the opportunity to consolidate their efforts under way to achieve definitive peace in South Sudan.

The President: I shall now put the draft resolution to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour:
Côte d'Ivoire, France, Kuwait, Netherlands, Peru, Poland, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States of America

Against:
None

Abstaining:
Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Kazakhstan, Russian Federation

The President: The draft resolution received 9 votes in favour and 6 abstentions. The draft resolution has been adopted as resolution 2428 (2018).

I shall now give the floor to those members of the Council who wish to make statements following the voting.

Mr. Delattre (France) (*spoke in French*): France welcomes adoption of resolution 2428 (2018), which renews the sanctions regime on South Sudan for one year. France nevertheless listened attentively to our colleagues from Ethiopia and Equatorial Guinea, and shares their desire for the Security Council to remain united in supporting the political process and initiatives led by the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) and African Union.

The resolution is not intended to undermine negotiations conducted by IGAD. Its goal is to protect civilian populations. It enables the establishment of an arms embargo that France has been urgently calling for several years. By limiting the flow of weapons towards South Sudan, the arms embargo is one of the most important measures that the Council can adopt to protect South Sudanese civilians. Furthermore, by adopting individual sanctions against two important military leaders from both sides, the Security Council is sending the clear message that impunity for acts of violence against civilians and violations of the most basic human rights and international humanitarian law can no longer be tolerated. Those who seek to prolong the conflict in contempt of their our own fellow citizens must be made aware that they will suffer the consequences of their actions.

The situation in South Sudan will improve in concrete terms only when the conflict is ended. France is encouraged by recent progress in the political process. France welcomes the commitment of IGAD and calls on the South Sudanese parties to finalize an agreement as soon as possible so that weapons are laid down once and for all and that the South Sudanese people can finally return to living their lives in the peace to which they aspire. Members may rest assured of France's determined commitment to that end.

Lastly, let me conclude by welcoming our new colleague from Côte d'Ivoire, His Excellency Mr. Kacou Houadja Léon Adom. It gives me great pleasure to welcome him here. Let me take this opportunity to commend the outstanding work of His Excellency Mr. Djédjé, who successfully carried out his interim duties following the passing of Bernard Tanoh-Boutchoue, who is sadly missed but whose memory is very much alive for us all and will remain a source of inspiration for the Council and myself — and whom I will never forget.

Mr. Lewicki (Poland): Poland voted in favour of resolution 2428 (2018), and we regret that we were unable to reach a consensus on that important text. We supported the resolution because we are appalled by the continuing violence in South Sudan, and we believe that it is the Security Council's responsibility to introduce adequate measures within its capacity with a view to scaling down and preventing the ongoing human tragedy in South Sudan.

Poland appreciates the regional efforts of African leaders and their leadership of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development in elaborating a viable political solution to the conflict and ending civil war in South Sudan. We see the measures adopted today by the

security Council as an important means to advance the peace process. We believe that stopping the uncontrolled flow of arms to the territory of South Sudan will result in a decrease in the number of clashes on the ground and violations of the ceasefire, but more important, it will significantly reduce violence and brutality against civilians. It is the resolution's key objective to protect civilians. In its previous resolutions, the Council has made it clear that the fighting in South Sudan must stop and that there will be consequences for those who violate the ceasefire and obstruct the peace process. We welcome the fact that today the Security Council decided to put its words into actions.

Lastly, let me extend my delegation's very warm welcome to the new Permanent Representative of Côte d'Ivoire, and we look forward to working with him and with his excellent team very closely.

Mr. Van Oosterom (Netherlands): I too would like to welcome our new colleague from Côte d'Ivoire, and we look forward to working with him very closely.

The Kingdom of the Netherlands welcomes the adoption of resolution 2428 (2018), especially the measures contained therein. The Netherlands has repeatedly called in the Council for the imposition of an arms embargo. That imposition underscores the fact that there is no military solution to the conflict. We especially welcome the sanctions imposed against two individuals. Their responsibility for gross human rights violations has been well documented. Today the Security Council is sending a clear message that the international community no longer tolerates the gross human rights violations in South Sudan, while underscoring the need to achieve tangible results in the ongoing political negotiations.

The Security Council will continue to monitor the situation in South Sudan and stands ready to act further if necessary. We very much welcome the insertion of specific designation criteria for sexual violence in resolution 2428 (2018). Through that extra set of references the Security Council acknowledges the systematic, structural and widespread nature of sexual violence in South Sudan. The reports on South Sudan bear witness to the horrific nature of those crimes time and time again, and if anyone can stomach it, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights report of earlier this week is a clear indication of that. Today the Council is sending a signal that this violence has to stop. The impunity must end.

Finally, we welcome the strength of the reference in the resolution to the link between conflict and hunger. It is a particular point of concern for the Kingdom of the Netherlands, and it is pertinent to the situation in South Sudan. We thank the penholder for her initiative, and the Council has given a very clear signal. It is now high time for the parties involved to achieve a sustained, peaceful political solution.

Mr. Ma Zhaoxu (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): First of all, I would like to welcome the new Permanent Representative of Côte d'Ivoire, His Excellency Ambassador Adom, to the Council in his new capacity. I look forward to our fruitful cooperation in the Council.

The South Sudan political process is currently at a crucial stage. With the mediation efforts of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), the African Union (AU), Ethiopia, the Sudan, Uganda and other regional organizations and countries, the South Sudan political process has recently made positive and recognized progress, clearly demonstrating that all the parties in South Sudan have the will to pursue peace and resolve issues through political channels.

In today's context, the Security Council must play its constructive role to the full and continue to lend all possible support to the mediation efforts of IGAD, the AU and the countries of the region. While they are working hard, we must continue to maintain our confidence and patience so as to help to facilitate the political process in South Sudan.

China has always maintained that sanctions should serve only as a means, not an end in themselves. Any measures taken by the Council should be conducive to ensuring the political settlement of relevant issues, not the reverse. The AU and IGAD have indicated on several recent occasions that it is neither advisable nor helpful to impose additional sanctions on South Sudan. The Security Council must listen to the legitimate aspirations of regional organizations and countries in Africa and take a cautious stance when it comes to imposing sanctions.

We have noted the fact that the penholders made certain improvements to resolution 2428 (2018) at the joint request of China and some other Council members. Now, however, the resolution still insists on imposing sanctions on South Sudan, including an arms embargo, that could complicate the situation and work against the advancement of the peace process. China abstained in the voting on the resolution for these reasons.

I would like to reiterate that the Chinese Government has consistently supported the peace process in South Sudan and has provided support to the country's efforts to restore national stability and development. Together with the rest of the international community, China stands ready to fully support the efforts to pursue peace being made by South Sudan, regional organizations and other countries of the region, and to make a constructive contribution to achieving lasting peace and stability in South Sudan and the African continent.

Mr. Llorentty Solíz (Plurinational State of Bolivia) (*spoke in Spanish*): At the outset, I would like to join my colleagues in welcoming the new Ambassador of Côte d'Ivoire and assuring him of our full support in his endeavours.

Bolivia regrets that the Security Council has not been able to maintain unity on this issue just when South Sudan needs it most. The gravity of the situation in the country is clear, and we deeply regret the suffering of the South Sudanese people.

Our decision to abstain in the voting on resolution 2428 (2018) is based on various elements that have gone unheeded regarding the imposition of an arms embargo and sanctions on the persons identified in annex 1 to the resolution. Bolivia believes that the only way to achieve stable and lasting peace in South Sudan is through a serious, inclusive and carefully constructed political process between the parties to the conflict and above all with the support of the region. That is exactly what the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) and the African Union have been developing over the past year and that could be seriously compromised by today's decision.

We regret that the express request of IGAD, the African Union, Uganda, the Sudan and Ethiopia that punitive action not be taken at this stage of the negotiations was not heeded, considering that positive progress has been made in recent weeks in the dialogue between the country's top leaders, who had not met in person for more than two years. The region has also set aside divisions that seemed irreconcilable in order to provide unanimous support to South Sudan. We believe that the best decision would have been to support the region until the conclusion of the ongoing talks, particularly since they are at a crucial stage, and to consider appropriate measures against those not demonstrating the necessary willingness to commit only if the parties failed to reach a genuine commitment. We must not underestimate the capacity of the region to resolve its conflicts, since they more than anyone want to achieve peace and stability. Unfortunately, we once again find ourselves making decisions over the recommendations of the region. We insist that such measures should be agreed on in principle with the relevant regional organizations.

In conclusion, I would like to commend the tireless work of the members of IGAD, the African Union and especially Uganda, the Sudan and Ethiopia, which have been essential stakeholders in mediating the reconciliation and agreement processes in their region, and with whom we are grateful to work on a daily basis in the Council. We are witnesses to their efforts and commitment to peace, and we reiterate our unconditional support for the work they are doing for their region.

Mr. Polyanskiy (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian delegation abstained in the voting on resolution 2428 (2018), on extending the sanctions on South Sudan. We are not trying to whitewash the situation in the country. We know that various parties continue to violate the ceasefire regime there and that the humanitarian situation is still serious. However, it is also clear that there has been some positive movement in the settlement process. Besides the meetings that have already taken place between the South Sudanese leaders Salva Kiir Mayardit and Riek Machar, it includes the signing on 27 June of the Khartoum Declaration and the plans made for holding the long-awaited negotiations in Nairobi in the very near future. In less than a month, thanks entirely to the efforts of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), the format set up for contact between South Sudan's politicians has been transformed into a full-on negotiation platform before our eyes. We agree with our Ethiopian colleague when he said, "If that is not progress, then what is?" Can those who genuinely care about seeing peace come to this long-suffering country really believe otherwise?

In the circumstances, it would make sense to support the approach of the African Union — the importance of strengthening our partnership with which we will be discussing in the Security Council next week — as well as to express our solidarity with the mediation efforts of IGAD, whose members, as we know, have declared unequivocally that expanding the sanctions pressure on South Sudan is highly inopportune. We regret that today our Council has taken this disappointing approach. Instead of listening to the regional position,

our colleagues mindlessly brandished the sanctions stick. We believe firmly that imposing sanctions on active participants in the political process or members of the Government is counterproductive. Nor will an arms embargo have a positive effect on the political settlement process. To hear our American colleagues, one might conclude that the embargo is a panacea for almost all ills.

We all know perfectly well that South Sudan is indeed flooded with weapons, but attempts to restrict the supply should not be directed only at Government forces. The experience of the neighbouring countries in the region shows that it is not embargoes that bring about an end to armed violence but systematic efforts to reform security structures, the implementation of weapons-collection programmes from the people, and the disarming and demobilizing of combatants.

Lastly, I should not omit to say that we have increasing questions about the working methods of the penholders, thanks to whose efforts the deep split in the Council over the South Sudan dossier continues. Such actions can hardly contribute to strengthening the authority of the Council or of the United Nations generally, a subject that those who supported today's resolution claim to care so much about. As we can see, their actions prove the opposite. As for Russia, we did not support and will not support a policy of imposing decisions on independent countries and regions that suit forces outside the region for domestic political or other reasons. It is to be hoped that despite today's destructive step, the fragile process of establishing a constructive dialogue between the parties in South Sudan will not be undermined, and that IGAD's mediation efforts will continue.

Mr. Tumysh (Kazakhstan): My delegation abstained in the voting on resolution 2428 (2018) because it does not reflect the positions and concerns of the countries of the region and the relevant regional organizations, the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) and the African Union, with regard to the timing of these actions. We want to point out that on 30 June the IGAD Council of Ministers decided that it was not helpful to pursue punitive measures at this stage. We highly commend the concerted efforts of the United Nations, the African Union and IGAD, as well as the mediation efforts of the countries of the region that helped to secure the Khartoum Declaration.

My delegation believes that despite today's adoption of resolution 2428 (2018), it is critically important to ensure that the Council remains united in its support for the efforts of IGAD and the African Union to achieve peace and stability in South Sudan. We must all stand up for a greater role for regional organizations in the Security Council's work and support them in their efforts to achieve progress.

We also urge the Government and opposition in South Sudan to work proactively and genuinely to implement the agreement and continue their inclusive and constructive peace talks to resolve the outstanding issues relating to governance and security arrangements. As an observer member of the African Union, we want to express our solidarity with the position expressed by the representatives of Ethiopia and Equatorial Guinea.

Lastly, we would also like to welcome the new Permanent Representative of Côte d'Ivoire and to cordially wish him every success in all his endeavours.

Mr. Alotaibi (Kuwait) (*spoke in Arabic*): I would first like to join speakers before me in welcoming the Permanent Representative of Côte d'Ivoire and wishing him every success in his work.

At the outset, we thank all the delegations of Member States for their flexibility during the conduct of the negotiations on resolution 2428 (2018), and we thank the United States delegation for cooperating in the negotiations on the draft text. We also welcome the important and positive developments and the efforts made by the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) to achieve a comprehensive political settlement. In that regard, we want to stress our full support for those efforts, while we also share the serious concern of other member States about the continuing conflict in South Sudan and its disastrous consequences for the civilian population and for peace and stability in the region.

The twenty-first report of the Ceasefire and Transitional Security Arrangements Monitoring Mechanism has confirmed the existence of continuing severe violations of the ceasefire that are worrying for all of us. But we believe in the importance and necessity of the mediation efforts of IGAD and the African Union countries, which should continue with the support of the international community and the Security Council. African crises first and foremost demand African solutions if they are to achieve permanent settlements. I believe that the technical extension in resolution

2418 (2018), the previous one on this topic, represents an opportunity to give the negotiations more time for achieving progress, while highlighting the tools that the Charter of the United Nations provides to the Security Council. The annex to today's resolution accords with the role of those who have been positively involved in the political process. We hope that today's resolution represents an opportunity that can enable the various parties in South Sudan to pursue their talks in order to achieve a comprehensive, just and appropriate settlement that puts an end to the conflict and stops the flow of more arms into the country so as to preserve people's lives, support peace and save South Sudan from the destructive cycle of war.

Ms. Pierce (United Kingdom): I would like to join my colleagues in welcoming our new colleague from Côte d'Ivoire. We look forward to working with him and would like to thank Ambassador Alcide Djédjé for his excellent cooperation in the interim.

We voted in favour of resolution 2428 (2018), but listening to some of the explanations of vote around the Chamber today, an outside observer could have been forgiven for thinking that the resolution was about the peace process. It is not. It is a resolution designed to protect the people of South Sudan. It imposes a long-needed arms embargo that will limit the flow of weapons that fuel the conflict in South Sudan, as well as further targeted sanctions on two individuals whose acts have expanded and extended the conflict and caused immeasurable suffering to the people of South Sudan. Both targets are military officials, and there is decisive evidence of responsibility on their part for human rights abuses. It would be a very sad commentary on the prospects for peace if those two measures designed to help the people of South Sudan were allowed to get in the way of and complicate the peace process. One cannot and does not advance peace by ignoring atrocities, and in my experience, if people are looking for a reason to abandon a peace process, they will find one, regardless of whether the Council takes action to protect the people of that country or not.

I would like to make it very clear that we expect the peace process to continue. We support the efforts of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development, the African Union and other regional organizations to that end, and we urge all leaders in South Sudan to work with them to advance the peace process.

The President: I shall now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of Sweden.

For millions of people in South Sudan, the long wait for their leaders to put an end to the fighting is not over. Despite the commendable efforts of the region to broker an agreement, the parties have not yet made the necessary compromises, and the fighting continues. Indeed, the ongoing efforts to unilaterally extend the mandates of Salva Kiir and the transitional Parliament raises questions as to whether participation in the negotiations is taking place in good faith.

The Secretary-General, in his report (S/2018/609) following resolution 2418 (2018), has confirmed that the fighting has not ceased. In addition, the recent joint report by the United Nations Mission in South Sudan and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, as well as reports from the Panel of Experts on South Sudan, contain harrowing accounts of violence against civilians, including widespread sexual and gender-based violence. The situation for women and girls is extremely difficult. This must come to an end.

Along with other Council members, we share a deep sense of frustration. The Council has stated its determination to ensure that the parties abide by their commitments, obligations and responsibilities. As the violence and mass atrocities continue, in flagrant disregard of international law and in violation of agreed ceasefires, the international community cannot stand idly by.

It is clear that the last thing needed in South Sudan at this moment is more weapons. Indeed, in the light of the commitments to a ceasefire made in Khartoum, which we welcome, the parties should have no need for them. Instead, all efforts and resources should be urgently directed at responding to the dire humanitarian situation. Doing so would help alleviate the suffering of the 7 million South Sudanese in need of humanitarian assistance. Unhindered humanitarian access must be ensured.

As the Emergency Relief Coordinator said in May,

> "Ending violence is the first and single most important thing needed to alleviate human suffering".

Additional weapons should not be able to reach parties that seem set on prolonging the conflict. We therefore support the imposition of a United Nations arms embargo on South Sudan, and it is for this reason

that we voted in favour of resolution 2428 (2018), adopted today.

A regionally brokered and inclusive political solution remains the only viable means of achieving peace. We commend the Intergovernmental Authority on Development and the wider region for their efforts towards such a political solution. This process must continue with vigour, and the Council must carefully consider how to best support the regional effort in order to also make a real difference on the ground, including by striking the right balance between encouragement and credible pressure. But most importantly, genuine goodwill and compromise must be shown by the countries' leaders, putting the interests of the people first.

The Council should stand ready to consider further targeted measures against individuals who incite violence or seek to derail the peace process. At the same time, we should also be ready to respond to positive developments.

To give the peace effort the best possible prospects for success, it is imperative that, as we move forward now, we stand unified and speak with one voice to the parties.

I now resume my functions as President of the Council.

I give the floor to the representative of South Sudan.

Mr. Malwal (South Sudan): Mr. President, let me at the outset congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month.

I would like to thank the members of the Council that abstained in the voting on resolution 2428 (2018), which included the representatives of Ethiopia and of Equatorial Guinea. They are arguing that the resolution is not helpful and will undermine peace. How does it undermine peace? It is not the resolution itself, but the adoption of a resolution at a time when the peace process is making positive advances will actually now tilt that balance for those parties that are negotiating. The opposition will think that the Security Council is on their side, so why should they continue to negotiate peace? That is why this resolution is unfortunate.

But my delegation really considers this resolution as an issue not between the Security Council and South Sudan, but between the Council, the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), the African Union and the continent. We keep hearing in the Council from time to time about a slap in the face. If there is a slap in the face, I think that this resolution is a slap in the face of those organizations that are trying to bring peace to South Sudan and Khartoum even as we speak.

We would like to commend IGAD and the African Union, and in particular President Omer Al-Bashir, President Yoweri Museveni and the Prime Minister of Ethiopia, Mr. Abiy Ahmed, for actually switching and coming up with a different approach that appears to be succeeding in bringing peace to South Sudan. The resolution, as we have said, will not help, but IGAD and South Sudan are still committed. We will seek peace within the region, within IGAD and within the African Union, and we hope that in the next few days there will be more positive news in that regard.

Again, I would like to thank those members that abstained, and we look forward to better news coming from Khartoum and South Sudan in the near future.

The meeting rose at 11.15 a.m.